

University of Groningen

Compartment formation and self-reproduction in dynamic combinatorial libraries

Bartolec, Boris

IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.

Document Version

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Publication date:

2017

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Bartolec, B. (2017). *Compartment formation and self-reproduction in dynamic combinatorial libraries*. [Thesis fully internal (DIV), University of Groningen]. University of Groningen.

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

The publication may also be distributed here under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license. More information can be found on the University of Groningen website: <https://www.rug.nl/library/open-access/self-archiving-pure/taverne-amendment>.

Take-down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.

Stellingen

behorende bij het proefschrift

"Compartment formation and self-reproduction in dynamic combinatorial libraries"

van

Boris Bartolec

1. Despite feasible recipes for the synthesis of artificial life being proposed,¹ the majority of research in this field focuses on making prebiotically plausible ingredients, rather than on their functional integration.
(1) Szostak, J. W.; Bartel, D. P.; Luisi, L. *Nature* **2001**, *409*, 387.
2. The evolutionary advantage that a mutation can contribute to a species needs to be understood at the overall population level, not only as a direct advantage for an individual. Simply by increasing the variety, a chance of a single threat eliminating the whole population decreases.
3. Not knowing the exact conditions under which life emerged makes the notion of "prebiotical plausibility" nonsense.
4. Amphiphiles both "love" and "hate" water. The same relationship is common for many PhD students and their research projects.
5. The more fundamental the research is, the longer it takes to get publishable results.
6. Experiments on a time scale of weeks or months seem to be very convenient during the course of a PhD. This suddenly changes when the "last" experiments need to be done to finish a chapter or a publication.
7. PhD students should write the introduction chapter of their thesis first, not last, as is common practice.
8. Glorifying manual laboratory work over intellectual efforts, that might take place in a seemingly more casual manner, can be a sign of a lack of doing the latter.
9. Since the propositions (stellingen) are not representative of the thesis' content nor quality in any way, and usually take away much of the attention from the actual work presented in a PhD thesis, their writing should be left to a PhD student as a choice, not an obligation.